

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/612,097	ECKHART ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JAMES RUTTEN	2192	

All Participants:

(1) JAMES RUTTEN

(2) Steven J. Hanke, Reg. No. 58,076

Date of Interview: 13 March 2008

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: *Proposed Claims (attached)*.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

102/103

Claims discussed:

1, 15, 29

Prior art documents discussed:

US 5,371,742 to Brown et al.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: Allowable

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Rutten contacted Mr. Hanke to discuss an examiner's amendment to the independent claims. Mr. Rutten indicated that the 11/26/07 claim amendments appeared to overcome the 102 rejections, but that new art was found (US 5,371,742 to Brown et al.) to provide the basis for a 103 rejection. However, a new reading of claims 30 and 32 revealed patentable subject matter, and that if the limitations of those claims were incorporated into the independent claims then the case would be allowable. Mr. Hanke essentially agreed to the proposal, but suggested that he review the claims and fax a copy of the changes. After review of the claims, Mr. Rutten called Mr. Hanke on 3/17/08 to further clarify what appeared to be a typo in the proposed language. Mr. Hanke agreed to change "said element object is a virtual element" to "said element object and a virtual element" in the proposed amended language.